UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/089,218	03/26/2002	Alex Ruelle	11345/047001	2586

22511   7590   06/21/2004

OSHA & MAY L.L.P.
1221 MCKINNEY STREET
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, PHU K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2671	

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004   5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/089,218	RUELLE, ALEX	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Phu K. Nguyen	2671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *3/26/2002*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-118* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-118* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☒ Other: *Please resubmit IDS filed 3/26/02*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16, 38, 40-44, 46-55, 57-60, 62-70, 78-79, 81-85, 87-96, 98-101 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DREWS et al. (5,831,615)

in view of Johnson et al. (6,400,379).

As per claim 1, Drews teaches the claimed "method of displaying a window on a

screen wherein the window has a background through which underlying objects are

visible" (Drews, column 5, lines 63-66). Drews does not explicitly teach that "the

method being carried out by a receiver/decoder". However, given Drews' computer host

1000 (column 4, lines 47-55), in which interface device 1019 receives the transmitted

data from a remote system (column 5, lines 11-14) and the microprocessor 1002

decodes and processes the transmitted information, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews'

system as claimed because the host system 1000 processing the transparency of

overlapped windows performs the function of a receiver/decoder to improve the

capability of access to the source of media data. It is noted that Drews does not

explicitly teach that "the receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a television set"

as claimed. Johnson teaches that the receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a

television set is well known in the art (Johnson, column 1, lines 56-63; and column 2,

lines 15-19. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews'

system as claimed because the television set performs in the same principle as Drews

monitor 1010 of the computer system 1000 and is a household item to provide a visual

pleasance to the viewer.

Claim 2 adds into claim 1 "drawing a frame of the window" which Drews teaches

in column 5, lines 48-67 (e.g., AmiPro window 34 with frame).

Claim 3 adds into claim 1 "the window forms part of a screen comprising a

window display" (Drews, column 5, lines 63-66); and the method further comprises

"combining the window display with a video image" which Drews does not teach.

However, Johnson teaches that the "combining the window display with a video image"

is well known in the art (Johnson, column 2, lines 15-22; the broadcast program 702). It

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made, in view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' system as claimed

because the window displaying the video image enhances the capability of application

windows and improves the quality of the display data in the application window.

Claim 4 adds into claim 1 "displaying a window on a television screen" which

Drews does not teach. Johnson teaches that "displaying a window on a television

screen" is well known in the art (Johnson, figure 9 - column 1, lines 56-63; and column

2, lines 15-19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews'

system as claimed because the television set performs in the same principle as Drews'

monitor 1010 of the computer system 1000 and is a household item to provide a visual

pleasance to the viewer.

Claim 5 adds into claim 1 the steps of defining the size of the window; drawing

foreground objects in the window; and arranging the background of the window which

Drews teaches in column 6, lines 17-31, and column 8, lines 46-50.

Claim 6 adds into claim 1 "the steps of defining the size of the window; drawing

foreground objects in the window; and arranging the background of the window such

that objects underlying the background are visible" which Drews teaches in column 6,

lines 17-31, and column 8, lines 46-50.

Claim 7 adds into claim 5 "wherein the step of drawing foreground objects

comprises setting foreground pixels to desired values" (Drews, column 8, line 64 to

column 9, line 9).

Claim 8 adds into claim 5 "the foreground objects comprise any or all of a straight

line, curved line, box, circle, triangle and typographical character, and preferably are

drawn in at least two draw operations" (Drews, column 7, lines 10-32; column 8, lines 59-61).

Claim 9 adds into claim 5 "the foreground object comprise interactive controls" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 9-30.

Claim 10 adds into claim 5 "the step of arranging the background comprises leaving at least one pixel value unaltered in a region defining the background" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 55-58.

Claim 11 adds into claim 5 "the step of arranging the background comprises blending at least one pixel value with a pixel value of an underlying image, in a region defining the background" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 50-55.

Claim 12 adds into claim 5 "the step of arranging the background comprises leaving at least one foreground pixel unaltered" which Drews teaches in column 8, lines 29-30 (e.g., the foreground drawings always appear on the top unaltered).

Claim 13 adds into claim 5 "at least one of the objects underlying the background comprises an element of a web page" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the references as claimed because the

web page is a household medium to receive the video media information in a

convenient and popular way similar to the television signal and the web page improves

the access to the sources of media data and network.

Claim 14 adds into claim 5 "displaying a further window which has a background

through which underlying objects are visible" which Drews teaches in column 8, lines

38-42, and column 9, lines 4-18.

Claim 15 adds into claim 14 "at least a part of the first window underlies the

further window" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

configure the cited references as claimed because the operation system such as

Microsoft Window (Drews, column 1, lines 63-64) supports the display of several

overlapped windows and enhances the flexibility of displaying a large number of

applications.

Claim 16 adds into claim 5 "monitoring drawing in a further window so that

drawing in the further window affecting said window can be corrected" which Drews

teaches in column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 2.

Claim 38 adds into claim 37 "the method is carried out by a receiver/decoder, the receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a television set." Drews does not explicitly teach that "the method being carried out by a receiver/decoder". However, given Drews' computer host 1000 (column 4, lines 47-55), in which interface device 1019 receives the transmitted data from a remote system (column 5, lines 11-14) and the microprocessor 1002 decodes and processes the transmitted information, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' system as claimed because the host system 1000 processing the transparency of overlapped windows performs the function of a receiver/decoder to improve the capability of access to the source of media data. It is noted that Drews does not explicitly teach that "the receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a television set" as claimed. Johnson teaches that the receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a television set is well known in the art (Johnson, column 1, lines 56-63; and column 2, lines 15-19. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' system as claimed because the television set performs in the same principle as Drews monitor 1010 of the computer system 1000 and is a household item to provide a visual pleasance to the viewer.

As per claim 40, Drews teaches the claimed device comprising "means (typically in the form of a processor – Drews' processor 1002) for displaying a window on a screen, wherein the window has a background through which underlying objects are

visible" (Drews, column 5, lines 63-66).   Drews does not explicitly teach that the device

is "a receiver/decoder". However, given Drews' computer host 1000 (column 4, lines

47-55), in which interface device 1019 receives the transmitted data from a remote

system (column 5, lines 11-14) and the microprocessor 1002 decodes and processes

the transmitted information, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' system as claimed

because the host system 1000 processing the transparency of overlapped windows

performs the function of a receiver/decoder to improve the capability of access to the

source of media data. It is noted that Drews does not explicitly teach that "the

receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a television set" as claimed. Johnson

teaches that the receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a television set is well

known in the art (Johnson, column 1, lines 56-63; and column 2, lines 15-19. It would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made, in view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' system as claimed

because the television set performs in the same principle as Drews monitor 1010 of the

computer system 1000 and is a household item to provide a visual pleasance to the

viewer.

Claim 41 adds into claim 40 "means for drawing a frame of the window" which

Drews teaches in column 5, lines 48-67 (e.g., AmiPro window 34 with frame).

Claim 42 adds into claim 40 "the displaying means is adapted to display window which forms part of a screen comprising a window display" (Drews, column 5, lines 63-66); and "means for combining the window display with a video image" which Drews does not teach. However, Johnson teaches that the "combining the window display with a video image" is well known in the art (Johnson, column 2, lines 15-22; the broadcast program 702). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' system as claimed because the window displaying the video image enhances the capability of application windows and improves the quality of the display data in the application window.

Claim 43 adds into claim 40 "the displaying means is adapted to display the window on a television screen" which Drews does not teach. Johnson teaches that "displaying a window on a television screen" is well known in the art (Johnson, figure 9 - column 1, lines 56-63; and column 2, lines 15-19). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' system as claimed because the television set performs in the same principle as Drews' monitor 1010 of the computer system 1000 and is a household item to provide a visual pleasance to the viewer.

Claim 44 adds into claim 40 the means for defining the size of the window; means for drawing foreground objects in the window; means for arranging the background of the window which Drews teaches in column 6, lines 17-31, and column 8, lines 46-50.

Claim 46 adds into claim 44 "the means for drawing foreground objects is adapted to set foreground pixels to desired values" (Drews, column 8, line 64 to column 9, line 9).

Claim 47 adds into claim 44 "the foreground object comprise any or all of a straight line, curved line, box, circle, triangle and typographical character, and are adapted to be drawn in at least two draw operations" (Drews, column 7, lines 10-32; column 8, lines 59-61).

Claim 48 adds into claim 44 "the foreground objects comprise interactive controls" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 9-30.

Claim 49 adds into claim 44 "the arranging means is adapted to leave at least one pixel value unaltered in a region defining the background" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 55-58.

Claim 50 adds into claim 44 "the arranging means is adapted to blend at least one pixel value with a pixel value of an underlying image, in a region defining the background" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 50-55.

Claim 51 adds into claim 44 "the arranging means is adapted to leave at least one foreground pix unaltered" which Drews teaches in column 8, lines 29-30 (e.g., the foreground drawings always appear on the top unaltered).

Claim 52 adds into claim 44 "at least one of the objects underlying the background comprises an element of a web page" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the references as claimed because the web page is a household medium to receive the video media information in a convenient and popular way similar to the television signal and the web page improves the access to the sources of media data and network.

Claim 53 adds into claim 44 "means for displaying a further window in which has a background through which underlying objects are visible" which Drews teaches in column 8, lines 38-42, and column 9, lines 4-18.

Claim 54 adds into claim 53 "at least apart of the first window underlies the further window" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

configure the cited references as claimed because the operation system such as

Microsoft Window (Drews, column 1, lines 63-64) supports the display of several

overlapped windows and enhances the flexibility of displaying a large number of

applications.

Claim 55 adds into claim 44 "means for monitoring drawing in a further window

so that drawing in the further window affecting said window can be corrected" which

Drews teaches in column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 2.

Claim 57 adds into claim 55 "means for determining a window which may be

affected by the drawing" (Drews, column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 7), and "for

sending a signal instructing a client of the window which may be affected to redraw at

least part of that window" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-18).

Claim 58 adds into claim 57 "the signal is a Java event" which the cited

references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made, given Drews' operating system such

as Microsoft Window, or its graphics rendering applications such as graphics API, to

configure system as claimed by use of a Java event signal because the Java signal is

used for its efficiency and friendly user interface and improves the interactive of the

display system.

Claim 59 adds into claim 57 "the signal is sent following each drawing operation" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-21.

Claim 60 adds into claim 59 "suppressing the signal for at least one drawing operation" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-19 (e.g., when the processor 1002 let other applications redraw their contents a number of times before redraw the Drews window).

Claim 62 adds into claim 57 "the signal is sent from a window manager" which Drews teaches in column 4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., processor 1002 acts as a window manager).

Claim 63 adds into claim 57 "the signal is sent from a client of a window preferably sent by the client which carried out the drawing, and preferably sent to a window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., the instructions for performing the update in the windows).

Claim 64 adds into claim 62 "means for making information related to the transparency of the window available to the window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 2-6 (e.g., the processor 1002 controls and monitors the rendering of transparency windows).

Claim 65 adds into claim 64 "means for storing the information as an attribute of the window" which Drews teaches in the update of transparency windows (column 12, lines 29 – the attributes of windows are active status, annotate windows, ...).

Claim 66 adds into claim 64 "means for sending the information to the window manager, preferably in a message or via a function call" which Drews teaches in column 4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., processor 1002 acts as a window manager sending and receiving messages during the rendering).

Claim 67 adds into claim 64 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in dependence on the information" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 16-18) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal dependence on the set-up of repeating steps improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 68 adds into claim 57 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in dependence on the relationship of the windows" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window depends on the active status of window

(column 12, lines 22-24) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the selecting of an active window among the display windows. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal dependence on the set-up of active window improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 69 adds into claim 57 "means for sending a signal following number of drawing operations, the number preferably being determined in advance of at least one drawing operation, and preferably being greater than 1, 3, 5, 10, 30, 50 or 100" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 12-18 (e.g., the number of repeating steps of update the information in the applications).

Claim 70 adds into claim 55 "means for redrawing at least part of the window which may be affected" which Drews teaches in the instruction to update the application windows while deciding whether to update the annotated window (column 12, lines 12-29).

Claim 78 adds into claim 77 "a television system, comprising a television set connectable to the receiver/decoder" which Drews does not teach. Johnson teaches that the receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a television set is well known in the art (Johnson, column 1, lines 56-63; and column 2, lines 15-19). It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in

view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' system as claimed because the

television set performs in the same principle as Drews monitor 1010 of the computer

system 1000 and is a household item to provide a visual pleasance to the viewer.

Claim 79 adds into claim 77 "a television system, comprising a television set

connected to the receiver/decoder" which Drews does not teach. Johnson teaches that

the receiver/decoder preferably being for use with a television set is well known in the

art (Johnson, column 1, lines 56-63; and column 2, lines 15-19). It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in

view of the teaching of Johnson, to configure Drews' system as claimed because the

television set performs in the same principle as Drews monitor 1010 of the computer

system 1000 and is a household item to provide a visual pleasance to the viewer.

Claims 81-85 claim a computer product for use with a receiver/decoder

comprising the codes to perform the steps of claims 1-5, respectively; therefore, they

are rejected under the same reason.

Claim 87 adds into claim 85 "the code for drawing foreground objects is adapted

to set foreground pixels to desired values" (Drews, column 8, line 64 to column 9, line

9).

Claim 88 adds into claim 84 "the foreground objects comprise any or all of a straight line, curved line, box, circle, triangle and typographical character, and preferably are adapted to be drawn in at least two draw operations" (Drews, column 7, lines 10-32; column 8, lines 59-61).

Claim 89 adds into claim 84 "the foreground object comprise interactive controls" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 9-30.

Claim 90 adds into claim 84 "the arranging code is adapted to leave least one pixel value unaltered in a region defining the background" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 55-58.

Claim 91 adds into claim 84 "the arranging code is adapted to blend at least one pixel value with a pixel value of an underlying image, in a region defining the background" which Drews teaches in column 11, lines 50-55.

Claim 92 adds into claim 84 "the arranging code is adapted to leave at least one foreground pixel unaltered" which Drews teaches in column 8, lines 29-30 (e.g., the foreground drawings always appear on the top unaltered).

Claim 93 adds into claim 84 "at least one of the objects underlying the background comprises an element of a web page" which the cited references do not

teach. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the references as claimed because the web page is a household medium to receive the video media information in a convenient and popular way similar to the television signal and the web page improves the access to the sources of media data and network.

Claim 94 adds into claim 84 "code for displaying a further window which has a background through which underlying objects are visible" which Drews teaches in column 8, lines 38-42, and column 9, lines 4-18.

Claim 95 adds into claim 94 "at least a part of the first window underlies the further window" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the cited references as claimed because the operation system such as Microsoft Window (Drews, column 1, lines 63-64) supports the display of several overlapped windows and enhances the flexibility of displaying a large number of applications.

Claim 96 adds into claim 84 "code for monitoring drawing in a further window so that drawing in the further window effecting said window can be corrected" which Drews teaches in column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 2.

Claim 98 adds into claim 96 "code for defining a window which may be affected by the drawing" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-18) and " for sending a signal instructing a client of the window which may be affected to redraw at least part of that window" which Drews teaches in the instruction to update the application windows while deciding whether to update the annotated window (column 12, lines 12-29).

Claim 99 adds into claim 98 "the signal is a Java event" which the cited references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, given Drews' operating system such as Microsoft Window, or its graphics rendering applications such as graphics API, to configure system as claimed by use of a Java event signal because the Java signal is used for its efficiency and friendly user interface and improves the interactive of the display system.

Claim 100 adds into claim 98 "the signal is sent following each drawing operation" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-21.

Claim 101 adds into claim 100 "code for suppressing the signal for at least one drawing operation" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-19 (e.g., when the

processor 1002 let other applications redraw their contents a number of times before

redraw the Drews window).

Claims 17-37, 39, 45, 56, 61, 71-75, 77, 80, 102-116 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DREWS et al. (5,831,615).

As per claim 17, Drews teaches the claimed "method of drawing in a window

comprises drawing in the window and monitoring the drawing so that drawing affecting

an overlying window can be corrected" (Drews, column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 2).

Drews does not explicitly teach that "the method being carried out by a

receiver/decoder". However, given Drews' computer host 1000 (column 4, lines 47-55),

in which interface device 1019 receives the transmitted data from a remote system

(column 5, lines 11-14) and the microprocessor 1002 decodes and processes the

transmitted information, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' system as claimed because

the host system 1000 processing the transparency of overlapped windows performs the

function of a receiver/decoder to improve the capability of access to the source of media

data.

Claim 18 adds into claim 17 "determining a window which may be affected by the

drawing" (Drews, column 12, lines 8-9), and "sending a signal instructing a client of the

window which may be affected to redraw at least part of that window" which Drews

teaches in column 12, lines 11-18.

Claim 19 adds into claim 18 "the signal is a Java event" which the cited

references do not teach. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made, given Drews' operating system such

as Microsoft Window, or its graphics rendering applications such as graphics API, to

configure system as claimed by use of a Java event signal because the Java signal is

used for its efficiency and friendly user interface and improves the interactive of the

display system.

Claim 20 adds into claim 18 "the signal is sent following each drawing operation"

which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-21.

Claim 21 adds into claim 20 "suppressing the signal for at least one drawing

operation" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-19 (e.g., when the processor

1002 let other applications redraw their contents a number of times before redraw the

Drews window).

As per claim 22, Drews teaches the claimed "method of drawing in a window, the

method comprising providing "a first mode in which a signal is sent following each

drawing operation instructing a client of a window which may be affected by the drawing

to redraw at least part of that window" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-18). It is noted that

Drews does not explicitly teach "a second mode in which the sending of a signal is

suppressed". However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of

times (column 12, lines 16-18) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the

window depend upon the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal

improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 23 adds into claim 18 "the signal is sent from a window manager" which

Drews teaches in column 4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., processor

1002 acts as a window manager).

Claim 24 adds into claim 18 "the signal is sent from a client of a window

preferably sent by the client which carried out the drawing, and preferably sent to a

window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., the instructions

for performing the update in the windows).

Claim 25 adds into claim 18 "making information relating to the transparency the

window available to the window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 2-6

(e.g., the processor 1002 controls and monitors the rendering of transparency windows).

Claim 26 adds into claim 25 "storing information as an attribute of the window" which Drews teaches in the update of transparency windows (column 12, lines 29 – the attributes of windows are active status, annotate windows, ...).

Claim 27 adds into claim 25 "sending the information to the window manager, preferably in a message or via a function call" which Drews teaches in column 4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., processor 1002 acts as a window manager sending and receiving messages during the rendering).

Claim 28 adds into claim 25 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in dependence on the information" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 16-18) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal dependence on the set-up of repeating steps improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 29 adds into claim 18 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in dependence on the relationship of the windows" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window depends on the active status of window (column 12, lines 22-24) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the selecting of an active window among the display windows. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal dependence on the set-up of active window improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 30 adds into claim 18 "sending a signal following number of drawing operations, the number preferably being determined in advance of at least one drawing operation, and preferably being greater than 1, 3, 5, 10, 30, 50 or 100" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 12-18 (e.g., the number of repeating steps of update the information in the applications).

Claim 31 adds into claim 17 "redrawing at least part of the window which may be affected" (Drews, column 12, lines 12-18).

As per claim 32, Drews teaches the claimed "method of drawing in a windowing

system in which drawing in a window is monitored and a signal is sent to at least one

other window which may be affected by the drawing" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-18).

It is noted that Drews does not explicitly teach, "selecting a mode in which a signal to at

least one other window is suppressed for at least one drawing operation". However,

Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 16-

18) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the

mode setting the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious

to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure

Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the

rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 33 adds into claim 32 "selecting a mode in which a signal is sent to said at

least one other window, following said at least one drawing operation" which Drews

teaches in the controlling of update the application windows while deciding whether to

update the annotated window (column 12, lines 12-29).

Claim 34 adds into claim 32 "the signal is a signal instructing a client of a window

that may be affected by the drawing to redraw at least part of that window" which Drews

teaches in the instruction to update the application windows while deciding whether to

update the annotated window (column 12, lines 12-29).

As per claim 35, Drews teaches the claimed "method of displaying a window",

comprising "providing a window manager which manages the display of the window"

(Drews, column 4, lines 48-51 – the processor 1002). It is noted that Drews does not

explicitly teach, "passing information relating to the transparency of the window to the

window manager." However, Drews' rendering of annotated transparent window

(column 5, lines 63-67) suggests the passing of the related information to the processor

1002 to control the update of information in the application window and the annotated

transparent window. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in

the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed

because the passing of update information to the window manager improves the control

of display window and enhances the appearance of the overlapped transparent

windows.

Claim 36 adds into claim 35 "the window manager forms part of a virtual

machine" which Drews teaches in column 13, lines 43-47.

As per claim 37, Drews teaches the claimed "method of displaying a navigator

display wherein the navigator display comprises at least one window having a

transparent background" (Drews, column 5, lines 63-66). It is noted that Drews does

not teach the navigator is used "preferably for a web browser". However, it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to configure the references as claimed because the web browser is a household

medium to receive the web media information in a convenient and popular way similar

to the public broadcast signal and the web page improves the access to the sources of

media data and network.

As per claim 39, Drews teaches the claimed "method of displaying windows on a

screen" comprises "the first window having a background through which underlying

objects are visible" (Drews, column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 2), "determining

whether the first window overlaps the second window" (column 11, lines 52-58); and

"drawing in the second window; and redrawing at least part of the first window if the first

window overlaps the second window" (column 12, lines 11-16). Drews does not

explicitly teach that "the method being carried out by a receiver/decoder". However,

given Drews' computer host 1000 (column 4, lines 47-55), in which interface device

1019 receives the transmitted data from a remote system (column 5, lines 11-14) and

the microprocessor 1002 decodes and processes the transmitted information, it would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to configure Drews' system as claimed because the host system 1000 processing

the transparency of overlapped windows performs the function of a receiver/decoder to

improve the capability of access to the source of media data.

As per claim 45, Drews teaches the claimed device comprising: "means for

displaying a window" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-40); "means for defining the size of

the window" (Drews, column 6, lines 17-31); "means for drawing foreground objects in

the window" (Drews, column 11, lines 41-44); "means for arranging the background of

the window such that objects underlying the background are visible" (Drews, column 11,

lines 50-58). Drews does not explicitly teach that the device is "a receiver/decoder".

However, given Drews' computer host 1000 (column 4, lines 47-55), in which interface

device 1019 receives the transmitted data from a remote system (column 5, lines 11-

14) and the microprocessor 1002 decodes and processes the transmitted information, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to configure Drews' system as claimed because the host system 1000

processing the transparency of overlapped windows performs the function of a

receiver/decoder to improve the capability of access to the source of media data.

As per claim 56, Drews teaches the claimed device comprising: "means for

drawing a window" (Drews, column 11, lines 32-40); "means for monitoring the drawing

so that drawing affecting an overlying window can be corrected" (Drews, column 12,

lines 11-18). Drews does not explicitly teach that the device is "a receiver/decoder".

However, given Drews' computer host 1000 (column 4, lines 47-55), in which interface

device 1019 receives the transmitted data from a remote system (column 5, lines 11-

14) and the microprocessor 1002 decodes and processes the transmitted information, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to configure Drews' system as claimed because the host system 1000

processing the transparency of overlapped windows performs the function of a

receiver/decoder to improve the capability of access to the source of media data.

As per claim 61, Drews teaches the claimed device comprising "means for

drawing in a window wherein in the first mode a signal is sent following each drawing

operation instructing a client of a window which may be affected by the drawing to

redraw at least part of that window" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-18). It is noted that

Drews does not explicitly teach, "in the second mode the sending of a signal is

suppressed". However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of

times (column 12, lines 16-18) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the

window depend upon the mode setting the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the

update signal improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

As per claim 71, Drews teaches the claimed "apparatus for drawing in a

windowing system, comprising: means for drawing in a window; means for monitoring

the drawing in the window and for sending a signal to at least one other window which

may be affected by the drawing" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-18). It is noted that Drews

does not explicitly teach "means for selecting a mode in which a signal to at least one

other window is suppressed for at least one drawing operation". However, Drews'

updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 16-18)

suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the mode

setting the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a

person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews'

method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the

rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 72 adds into claim 71 "means for selecting a mode in which a signal is sent

to said at least one other window, following said at least one drawing operation" which

Drews teaches in the controlling of update the application windows while deciding

whether to update the annotated window (column 12, lines 12-29).

Claim 73 adds into claim 71 "the signal is a signal instructing a client of a window

that may be affected by the drawing to redraw at least part of that window" which Drews

teaches in the instruction to update the application windows while deciding whether to

update the annotated window (column 12, lines 12-29).

As per claim 74, Drews teaches the claimed "apparatus for displaying a window,

comprising: means (typically in the form of a processor – Drews' processor 1002) for

displaying the window; a window manager for managing the display of the window"

(Drews, column 4, lines 48-51 – the processor 1002). It is noted that Drews does not

explicitly teach, "means for passing information relating to the transparency of the

window to the window manager." However, Drews' rendering of annotated transparent

window (column 5, lines 63-67) suggests the passing of the related information to the

processor 1002 to control the update of information in the application window and the

annotated transparent window. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method

as claimed because the passing of update information to the window manager improves

the control of display window and enhances the appearance of the overlapped

transparent windows.

Claim 75 adds into claim 74 "the window manager forms part of a virtual

machine" which Drews teaches in column 13, lines 43-47.

Claim 77 adds into claim 76 "a receiver/decoder" which Drews does not teach.

However, given Drews' computer host 1000 (column 4, lines 47-55), in which interface

device 1019 receives the transmitted data from a remote system (column 5, lines 11-

14) and the microprocessor 1002 decodes and processes the transmitted information, it

would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to configure Drews' system as claimed because the host system 1000

processing the transparency of overlapped windows performs the function of a receiver/decoder to improve the capability of access to the source of media data.

As per claim 80, Drews teaches the claimed device for "displaying windows on a screen" comprises "means (typically in the form of a processor – Drews' processor 1002) for displaying first and second windows, at least the first window having a background through which underlying objects are visible" (Drews, column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 2), "means (typically in the form of a processor) for determining whether the first window overlaps the second window" (column 11, lines 52-58); and "means (typically in the form of a processor) for drawing in the second window; and means (typically in the form of a processor) for redrawing at least part of the first window if the first window overlaps the second window" (column 12, lines 11-16). Drews does not explicitly teach that the device is "a receiver/decoder". However, given Drews' computer host 1000 (column 4, lines 47-55), in which interface device 1019 receives the transmitted data from a remote system (column 5, lines 11-14) and the microprocessor 1002 decodes and processes the transmitted information, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' system as claimed because the host system 1000 processing the transparency of overlapped windows performs the function of a receiver/decoder to improve the capability of access to the source of media data.

As per claim 102, Drews teaches the claimed "computer program product comprising code for drawing in a window, in first and second modes, wherein in the first mode a signal is sent following each drawing operation instructing a client of a window which may be affected by the drawing to redraw at least part of that window" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-18). It is noted that Drews does not explicitly teach "a second mode in which the sending of a signal is suppressed". However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 16-18) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 103 adds into claim 102 "the signal is sent from a window manager" which Drews teaches in column 4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., processor 1002 acts as a window manager).

Claim 104 adds into claim 102 "the signal is sent from a client of a window and is sent by the client which carried out the drawing, and is sent from a client to a window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., the instructions for performing the update in the windows).

Claim 105 adds into claim 103 "code for making information relating to the transparency of the window available to the window manager" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 2-6 (e.g., the processor 1002 controls and monitors the rendering of transparency windows).

Claim 106 adds into claim 105 "code for storing the information as an attribute of the window" which Drews teaches in the update of transparency windows (column 12, lines 29 – the attributes of windows are active status, annotate windows, ...).

Claim 107 adds into claim 105 "code for sending the information to the window manager, preferably in a message or via action call" which Drews teaches in column 4, lines 48-55; and column 12, lines 11-18 (e.g., processor 1002 acts as a window manager sending and receiving messages during the rendering).

Claim 108 adds into claim 105 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in dependence on the information" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 16-18) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method

as claimed because the suppression of the update signal dependence on the set-up of repeating steps improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 109 adds into claim 105 "the sending of a signal is suppressed in dependence on the relationship of the windows" which Drews does not explicitly teach. However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window depends on the active status of window (column 12, lines 22-24) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the selecting of an active window among the display windows. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal dependence on the set-up of active window improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 110 adds into claim 105 "code for sending a signal following a number of drawing operations, the number being determined in advance of at least one drawing operation, and being greater than 1, 3, 5, 10, 30, 50 or 100" which Drews teaches in column 12, lines 12-18 (e.g., the number of repeating steps of update the information in the applications).

Claim 111 adds into claim 105 "code for redrawing at least part of the window, which may be affected," (Drews, column 12, lines 12-18).

As per claim 112, Drews teaches the claimed "apparatus for drawing in a windowing system, comprising: code for drawing in a window; code for monitoring the drawing in the window and for sending a signal to at least one other window which may be affected by the drawing" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-18). It is noted that Drews does not explicitly teach "code for selecting a mode in which a signal to at least one other window is suppressed for at least one drawing operation". However, Drews' updating of re-drawn window is withhold a number of times (column 12, lines 16-18) suggests the suppression of the signal to redraw the window depend upon the mode setting the number of withholds of update step. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure Drews' method as claimed because the suppression of the update signal improves the rendering speed in case of many updated applications.

Claim 113 adds into claim 112 "code for selecting a mode in which a signal is sent to said at least one other window, following said at least one drawing operation" which Drews teaches in the controlling of update the application windows while deciding whether to update the annotated window (column 12, lines 12-29).

Claim 114 adds into claim 112 "the signal is a signal instructing a client of a window that may be affected by the drawing to redraw at least part of that window"

which Drews teaches in the instruction to update the application windows while deciding

whether to update the annotated window (column 12, lines 12-29).

As per claim 115, Drews teaches the claimed "apparatus for displaying a window,

comprising: code for displaying the window; a window manager for managing the

display of the window" (Drews, column 4, lines 48-51 – the processor 1002). It is noted

that Drews does not explicitly teach, "code for passing information relating to the

transparency of the window to the window manager". However, Drews' rendering of

annotated transparent window (column 5, lines 63-67) suggests the passing of the

related information to the processor 1002 to control the update of information in the

application window and the annotated transparent window. Thus, it would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

configure Drews' method as claimed because the passing of update information to the

window manager improves the control of display window and enhances the appearance

of the overlapped transparent windows.

Claim 116 adds into claim 115 "the window manager forms part of a virtual

machine" which Drews teaches in column 13, lines 43-47.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 76, 86, 97, 117, and 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by DREWS et al. (5,831,615).

As per claim 76, Drews teaches the claimed "apparatus for displaying a navigator display (Drews, column 5, lines 42-67), comprising means (typically in the form of a processor – Drews' processor 1002) for displaying the navigator display in such a way that the navigator display comprises at least one window having a transparent background" (Drews, column 11, lines 50-58).

As per claim 86, Drews teaches the claimed "computer program product" comprising "code for displaying a window; code for defining the size of the window" (column 6, lines 17-23); "code for drawing foreground objects in the window; and code for arranging the background of the window such that objects underlying the background are visible" which Drews teaches in column 8, lines 46-50.

As per claim 97, Drews teaches the claimed "computer program product" comprising: "code for drawing in a window" (Drews, column 12, lines 11-12); and "code for monitoring the drawing so that drawing affecting an overlying window can be corrected" (Drews, column 12, lines 12-16).

As per claim 117, Drews teaches the claimed "apparatus for displaying a navigator display (Drews, column 5, lines 42-67), comprising code for displaying the navigator display in such a way that the navigator display comprises at least one window having a transparent background" (Drews, column 11, lines 50-58).

As per claim 118, Drews teaches the claimed device for "displaying windows on a screen" comprises "code for displaying first and second windows, at least the first window having a background through which underlying objects are visible" (Drews, column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 2), "code for determining whether the first window overlaps the second window" (column 11, lines 52-58); and "code for drawing in the second window; and code for redrawing at least part of the first window if the first window overlaps the second window" (column 12, lines 11-16).

Claims 1, 8, 24, 27, 30, 37, 38, 63, 66, 69, 101 and 116 are objected to of the following informalities: the word "preferably" is unclear as what it means. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 40, and 80 are objected to of the following informalities: the word "typically" is unclear as what it means. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 4-6 should be renumbered as -- 3-5 --.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 86, 97, 102-111, 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention as a whole must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible" result to have a practical application. In claims 86, 97, 102, and their dependent claims, the claimed "computer product" is unclear as whether it can be used with a computer or device to make them "concrete and tangible." Correction is required.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phu K. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703)305 - 9796. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phu K. Nguyen
June 9, 2004